

OTTAWA
CITY PASSENGER RAILWAY
COMPANY.

**PROPOSITIONS MADE BY THE JOINT
COMMITTEE TO THE OTTAWA
CITY PASSENGER RAILWAY COM-
PANY.**

1st. That but one track be laid in any street in the city, except by special agreement in writing, between the Railway Company and the Corporation.

2nd. That the right of the city to repair the streets, open drains, lay gas or water pipes, be acknowledged by the railway company in writing, and that the company shall have no claim against the Corporation for damages while such repairs or works are in progress.

3rd. That no track be laid across the Sappers' Bridge while it is in its present state, but

that the Directors of the Company, and the Corporation, shall use joint exertions to have it widened, and a new bridge erected from Wellington to Rideau-sts.

4th. That the company shall use sleighs, instead of carriages, from the commencement of the sleighing until the end thereof.

HENRY J. FRIEL,
JOHN P. FEATHERSTON,
CHARLES GOULDEN,
A. PRATT,
C. W. BANGS,
ROBERT HUNTER,
GEORGE HAY,
F. McDOUGAL,
THOMAS HUNTON.

Ottawa, 25th March 1868

On the 26th March the following letter was received by the Chairman of the Joint Committee, viz :

OFFICE OF THE OTTAWA C. P. R. R. Co'y,

New Edinburgh, March 26th, 1868.

To H. J. FRIEL, Esqr., Mayor of Ottawa, and
Chairman of the Joint Committee on
Street Railway.

Sir,

The Committee of the Board of Directors of the Ottawa City P. R. R. Co'y., to whom the question of conference with the Joint Committee of the Corporation and certain citizens has been referred, have had under their consideration the Memorandum submitted by the Joint Committee yesterday, and before bringing the same under the notice of the Directors, beg leave respectfully to solicit some explanations with regard to the 1st Proposition—In the event of the Company consenting—1st. How is it proposed to compensate them for any loss sustained on material already provided for the double track?—and 2nd. If upon trial it be found that a single track cannot be made self-sustaining (that is, cannot earn enough to cover the daily working expenses,) would the objection to a double track still be persisted in?—and if so, is it proposed then to compensate the Street Railway Company?

With regard to the 2nd proposition :—Is it proposed to acquire the right to stop the traffic on the Street Railway entirely for any length of time, and how long? or would the Company be allowed to shift their Tracks so as to keep their cars running?

With regard to the 3rd proposition,—as this involves an indefinite suspension of the Street Railway undertaking,—1st. Is it proposed to compensate the Company for interest on outlay already incurred pending the delay? and for any loss which may arise from decay or depreciation of Timber? In case a new or wider bridge is not provided before the expiration of the Company's Charter, will the Corporation support a further extension of time?

Please have the goodness to submit these queries to the Joint Committee, and when their answer is received the Directors will be able to reply fully to all the propositions submitted them on behalf of your Committee.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your obdt. servt.,

(Signed) ROBERT SURTEES,

Secy. O. C. P. R. R. Co.

CITY HALL, March 30, 1868.

To the President and Directors of the Street Railway
Company.

Gentlemen,

In reply to your communication of the 26th instant, the Joint Committee of Corporation and Citizens have to say, that they are not instructed to consider any question of compensation for any alleged probable loss in the

operations of the Street Railway under the proposed changes suggested by the Joint Committee, nor can the Committee suppose that any well founded claim exists for such considerations.

So far as the 2nd proposition, the Committee believe that no right is sought to stop the Railway traffic at any time, and if necessary there can be no objection to the shifting of the Tracks. All the Committee desire is the right to repair and open streets when necessary, without being subject to the caprice or claim for damages of the Company.

If the Company agree to the propositions of the Committee, and place them in legal shape, the extension of time will not be opposed by the Corporation, if the suggestions of the Committee prevail.

A prompt reply from the Directors is sought for, as the Committee desire to report, and recommend further steps at the meeting of the Corporation on Monday next.

(Signed) T. HUNTON,

C. T. BATE,

F. McDougall,

Committee of Citizens.

(Signed) H. J. FRIEL, *Chairman.*

R. HUNTER,

J. P. FEATHERSTON,

A. PRATT,

C. W. BANGS,

C. GOULDEN,

I. TRAVERSEY,

Committee of Corporation.

**REPLY OF THE DIRECTORS O.C.P.
R.R. Co., TO THE PROPOSITIONS
OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE.**

Office of the Ottawa City Passenger R.R. Co., New Edinburgh, April 4, 1868.

The Directors have had under consideration the propositions of the Joint Committee, submitted on 25th March, and the explanations of same of 30th March.

Of the four propositions, the first three only are important, because as to the fourth there would be no difference.

Two of the propositions, those relating to the double track and Sappers' Bridge (the 1st and 3rd) may be urged on stronger grounds than the remaining one (the 2nd) which relates to street repairs, because that simply involves the question whether the Corporation of Ottawa, or the Street Railway Company, shall sustain possible charges which the Legislature of Canada has not imposed upon the Street Railway Company. As this is the least important proposition, it may at once be disposed of. The proposition is two-fold, it seeks the acknowledgment (by the Street Railway Company) of the right of the city to do certain things in the street, a right which this company is not empowered, and never has intended, to dispute; and secondly, that "the Company shall have no claim against the Corporation for damages, while such repairs or works are in progress." The Company can only be damaged by the interruption of its traffic. As a matter of fact, it is not found to be necessary in other cities to interrupt traffic for the purpose of street repairs or works. The traffic of the Street Railway is of such public importance that every effort is made, and no difficulty is

experienced in carrying on street works without interrupting it.

The Directors believe that any inconvenience to the making of street repairs, arising from the railway tracks, will be outweighed by the greater public convenience of the railway, and they assume that this was the view of the Legislature and of the Corporation of Ottawa, when the charter was granted.

The Directors are gratified to find the Corporation has not insisted upon the maintenance of the streets between and outside the tracks as urged at Toronto, and they take this opportunity of assuring the Corporation and the citizens that if they could depend upon earning more than the amount necessary to pay working expenses, they would not object to become liable for items assumed by Street Railway Companies in larger cities. But they feel it would be deceptive on their part to promise what they may be unable to perform, and they are sure the good sense of the people will acknowledge that obligations to bear certain burdens are of no value without there is adequate responsibility. It is in this view that the Company is unwilling to assume burdens it is incapable of sustaining, and they wish to meet the second proposition fairly. If the Corporation seek the right to interrupt the traffic of the street railway at will, without compensation, the Directors are convinced that this would be ruinous to the Company, and destructive to the usefulness of the railway. If this right be not sought, the Directors are unable to see any necessity for the proposition. In any case it is a mere money question of trifling importance to the Corporation, as compared with the Company, and the question is merely which is most able, and which, under all the circumstances, ought to bear the cost, if any.

With respect to the third proposition, that no track be laid across Sappers' Bridge while in its present state, the Directors feel that this amounts to an indefinite postponement of the railway without cause, and without compensation for the loss the Company may thereby sustain. The rails themselves will not obstruct the traffic any more upon this bridge than elsewhere, and as to a passing car, the track being laid on one side would leave the other free, with far less risk in meeting the car (which is confined to its position) than in meeting any other vehicle. In connection with this matter, the Directors assume that the parapets of this bridge will be removed, as they form an obstruction each greater than the combined width of both, for if removed there would be a solid roadway ample for three vehicles abreast.

The Directors have purposely reserved the first proposition until the last, because it is not only the most important to both parties, but they feel it is the only one point of necessary difference.

The Directors can only account for this unexpected opposition to the provisions of a charter obtained here less than two years ago, without opposition by either the Corporation or any of the citizens, on the assumption that the project was so hopeless a one that there was no prospect of its being realized; and that with reference to the double track provision it was supposed that a single track would probably be more than could be accomplished. Experience has established that a double track, while accommodating the public far better, can be worked at much less cost, and will earn much more money than a single one with its necessary turnouts or switches. The Directors have, therefore, come to the conclusion that it was

most important to attain the maximum of earnings with the minimum of expenditure, in a case where it was problematical whether or not a Street Railway could be maintained.

The Directors believe that the interests of the general public will be best consulted by a double track, in preference to a single one with "switches or turnouts." Wherever there is a switch there is a double track, and if it were true, as has been alleged, that a double track would block up the street, the same result must take place with a single track at every place where there is a turnout, because the two tracks which form the turnout must occupy the same position in the street which a double track will. It is capable of proof, therefore, that a street wide enough for a single track is, as to the question of room for vehicles to stand before the shops, equally wide for a double one. Unless the single track is placed in the centre of the street, (in which case it would probably be over a sewer) it must occupy the same position on one side of the centre, as if the track were doubled. By leaving six feet of the centre of the street as the space between the tracks, the distance between the rail and sidewalk will be 13 feet in a 66 feet street, and 10 feet in a 60 feet street, which is ample for drawing up in front of shops while the car is passing. If a Street Railway is in this respect to be an injury to the shops, it would seem that the only difference between a single and double track, is that in the former case only one side of the street would be affected, except at the switches, while in the other both sides would be on a par. With a single track, therefore, the Company (or Corporation) will be compelled to make a selection of one side of the street for the main track, against the wishes of shopkeepers on that side, and a location of switches equally

obnoxious to shops opposite on the other side. To the driving public, the switches are the most objectionable feature in Street Railways, because by their connection with the main track at each end the rails cross the street diagonally, and this with the moveable bar, and wing rail, affect the roadway, as far as they go, more unfavorably than the parallel rails of the double track.

To the travelling public, the effect of switches is detention. When a car reaches a switch, it cannot pass these, unless the one from the opposite direction has arrived, and it is impossible in the varying conditions of the streets in this climate so to work time tables as to avoid delays. In consequence of the necessity of providing for this probable delay the time table over the whole length must be lengthened, so that a car must be allowed three quarters of an hour to go through on a single line, where half an hour would be sufficient on the double line. It follows from this that to make the same number of trips per diem, or rather to run a car every quarter of an hour, five cars will be wanted instead of four—the extra car requiring eight extra horses and two extra men. There is thus an increase of 25 per cent. in the working expenses, while it is estimated that the loss of fares by the detention of switches is at least 20 per cent. Thus while the switches are objectionable, both to the driving public, and the car-riding public, their effect on the Company is to increase the expenses and diminish the receipts.

The Directors do not assert that a Street Railway is an unmixed blessing, nor can this be said of steam railways. They assume that the Legislature and the Ottawa Corporations of 1865 and 1866, in view of the great public advantage of a safe, easy, and

speedy transport within the reach of all authorized the laying down of rails in certain streets, and in view of the risk to be incurred financially a very favorable charter was granted. Under that charter this Company has been organized after giving full publicity to all its provisions, and not until the enterprise was far advanced, and heavy liabilities had been incurred, was there any whisper of opposition.

The Directors have given their reasons in full in explanation of their inability to comply with the propositions of the Joint Committee, and have now only to say that so far from being desirous of exercising the powers conferred on them rigorously they are desirous of meeting the wishes of all parties, so far as they can do so consistent with the efficiency of the Street Railway for the public, and as a self-sustaining enterprise. They do not look for profits, though they have the right to do so, but, as responsible for the success or failure of the enterprise, they claim the right to carry it out, within the terms of their charter, in the manner which, according to their judgment, appears

most likely to secure its continuance. But they are quite prepared to step aside and transfer the whole undertaking in its present shape, with all assets and liabilities, to the Corporation, the Joint Committee, or others who may have different views as to how it should be done. They will engage that the Shareholders will transfer the undertaking, without any other consideration than that the Railway, whether single or double track, shall be built, equipped, and brought into use within a reasonable time.

The Directors were gratified to hear all the members of the Joint Committee express themselves in favor of a Street Railway, and they are, therefore, encouraged to hope that the Joint Committee will either accept this offer, or if indisposed to do so, assist the Directors in carrying out the work as proposed

THOS. C. KEEFER, President.

J. M. CURRIER,

H. O. BURRITT,

ROBERT BLACKBURN,

W. G. PERLEY,

HORACE MERRILL,

W. McNAUGHTON.

} Directors.

ut
nd
re-
to
or
to
ge
er-
an
le
ht

all
ss
nd
at
ais
Di-
d

ora.